

# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ARIZONA ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS TASK FORCE

**December 18, 2006  
1:30 p.m., MST**

The Arizona English Language Learners (ELL) Task Force met in Room 1 of the Arizona Senate Building, 1700 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. MST.

## **1. Call to Order**

Present:

Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman  
Dr. John Baracy  
Mr. Jim DiCello  
Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan  
Ms. Johanna Haver  
Ms. Karen Merritt

Absent:

Dr. Eugene Garcia  
Ms. Anna Rosas  
Ms. Eileen Klein

A quorum was present for the purpose of conducting business.

## **2. Approval of October 2, 2006, October 11, 2006 and October 24, 2006 minutes of Task Force Meetings**

Mr. Alan Maguire called for the approval of the October 2, 2006 and October 11, 2006 minutes. Dr. Baracy requested that the minutes of October 11, 2006 be amended to show that he was present and not teleconferencing. Mr. Jim DiCello moved and Ms. Karen Merritt seconded that the minutes of October 2, 2006 be approved and that the minutes of October 11, 2006 be approved as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Baracy distributed to the Task Force members the article entitled "*Inadequate Conclusions from an Inadequate Assessment: What Can SAT-9 Scores Tell Us about the Impact of Proposition 227 in California?*" By Yuko Goto Buter, Jennifer Evelyn Orr, Michele Bousquet Gutiérrez, and Kenji Hakuta, Stanford University. Dr Baracy indicated at the December 14<sup>th</sup> ELL Task Force meeting in Tucson that he wanted to share this article with the Task Force members.

### **3. Presentation and discussion on the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS)**

Ms. Janice McGoldrick, Chief Information Officer, Arizona Department of Education (ADE), presented an overview of the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS). Ms. McGoldrick stated that the implementation of SAIS was the result of Arizona voter approval of Proposition 301 in 2000. Before the SAIS, Local Education Agencies (LEA) provided aggregated English Language Learner (ELL) data to ADE. Proposition 301 required the implementation of financial and academic accountability measures and the development of a student identification information system. As a result of Proposition 301, Arizona became the first state to have a unique student identification system. (See Attachment A, *“Arizona Department of Education Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) and its role with ELL”*)

Ms. McGoldrick stated that student information is stored and managed locally through Student Management Systems (SMS) and sent to ADE’s SAIS Student Detail Database via the Internet. Districts and charter schools may create their own SMS as long as their systems comply with the SAIS data requirements. Since fiscal year 2004, individual, not aggregate, student data has been collected.

Ms. McGoldrick reviewed the process for creating a new ELL student data file. The process begins when a LEA enrolls a new ELL student. Then, the school assesses the student’s English language proficiency using the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA). The assessment is scored by Harcourt Assessment, Inc. Harcourt returns the student assessment data to the LEA. The LEA enters the student assessment data into SAIS. Student information data, including assessment data, is validated by ADE. Data that has been validated is transmitted to ADE’s financial system for appropriations.

There are three levels of validation: file, record, and integrity. The file validation level checks that each file submitted to SAIS meets the posted file structure requirements. The record validation level checks that each individual record of ELL assessments and ELL program participants submitted meets the posted transaction structure requirements. The integrity validation level checks that all ELL assessment and ELL program participation data in SAIS for a specific student meets posted business rule requirements. Once the validation process is complete, SAIS can generate reports at the student, school, and district or charter holder level. These reports include information, such as: student assessment scores, individual student proficiency levels, and the number of reclassified Fluent English Proficient (FEP) students.

Ms. McGoldrick stated that state aid for ELL students is based on two factors; “add-on weight” and ELL student attendance on three program participation dates. The state multiplies the add-on weight of 0.115% to the base level funding for each ELL student participating in an ELL program during all three of the program participation dates.

Mr. Alan Maguire asked if SAIS can determine if a child moves from one school to another. Ms. McGoldrick stated that ideally schools are sharing student data. However, if a student moves

from one school to another school, and the new school is unaware of any previous enrollment in an ELL program, the receiving school will be notified by SAIS, through data validation, if there are multiple files on the same student. If there is an older record of the same student, ADE will consolidate the data. Ms. McGoldrick stated that there are multiple filters to determine duplication of student data, including data from past years. Mr. Jim DiCello asked if an ELL student enters an ELL program in late December and is counted for only one of the three participation dates, does that student receive only one third of the funding dollars. Ms. McGoldrick answered, "Yes." Dr. John Baracy asked what the validation timeframe is for ADE to return SAIS data to LEAs. Ms. McGoldrick said that during the validation process, some errors can be corrected quickly, and files can be returned in a timely manner. In other cases where there are errors in student participation numbers for determining funding, data validation takes longer. She stated that ADE is working on expediting this process. Dr. Baracy asked how delays in funding data validation would affect the responsibilities of the Task Force. Ms. McGoldrick stated that data from the 40<sup>th</sup> day of school had already been verified as of the first week of December.

#### **4. Presentation and discussion of the various teacher qualifications/certification levels in Arizona**

Ms. Jan Amator, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Certification, Arizona Department of Education, gave a presentation on the basic certifications for educators as outlined in Article 6 of the Arizona Administrative Code. See Attachment B, *Arizona Administrative Code* and Attachment C, *"Certification Basics"*.

Ms. Amator stated that there are several certification categories, such as: elementary teaching; secondary teaching; special education teaching; career and technical education teaching; early childhood education teaching; administrative; and other professional categories, e.g., speech and language pathologists, and psychologists. Ms. Amator shared the process of how a new teacher acquires a teaching certificate. A new teacher is issued a two-year provisional teaching certificate by passing the appropriate professional knowledge exam and the content knowledge test or by successfully completing 24 credit hours in a designated content area if a knowledge exam is not available in a specific content area. A standard teaching certificate is issued after the teacher completes two full years of teaching. Every six years, the teacher must renew his or her certificate by successfully completing 180 clock hours of professional development.

In addition to certification, Ms. Amator stated that there are endorsements. Endorsements can be added to certificates. There are several categories of endorsements, such as content-specific endorsements, e.g., dramatic arts, music, or physical education. In addition, there are endorsements for gifted education, early childhood education, middle grade education, bilingual education, English as a Second Language (ESL), Structured English Immersion (SEI), and Reading Specialist. The Reading Specialist endorsement is required for a reading consultant, a remedial reading teacher, a special reading teacher, or any similar position. This endorsement requires an Arizona elementary, secondary, or special education certificate and the successful

completion of 15 semester hours in courses such as decoding and diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties. A practicum in reading is also required. The Reading Specialist endorsement is currently in revision. Current recommendations include the increase of 15 semester hours to 24 semester hours.

Ms. Amator then reviewed with the Task Force the provisional and full endorsement requirements for Structured English Immersion (SEI). Ms. Amator stated that the SEI endorsement is unique because it is the only endorsement that is required by all teachers, whether or not they are teaching ELL students, and by all administrators. Furthermore, the SEI endorsement has different requirements depending on the time of issuance, does not accept out-of-state coursework, and requires approval by the Board of Education of all courses and professional development training. Ms. Amator said that teachers coming from out-of-state are given a year to earn their provisional SEI endorsement while teaching in an Arizona school.

Ms. Amator provided the following statistics on the number of ESL and Bilingual Endorsements that have been earned in the last three years.

**Total ESL Endorsements: 9819**

Number of Provisional ESL Endorsements

|             |     |
|-------------|-----|
| <b>2004</b> | 828 |
| <b>2005</b> | 659 |
| <b>2006</b> | 469 |

Number of Full ESL Endorsements

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| <b>2004</b> | 659  |
| <b>2005</b> | 754  |
| <b>2006</b> | 1201 |

**Total Bilingual Endorsements: 3194**

Number of Provisional Bilingual Endorsements

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| <b>2004</b> | 38 |
| <b>2005</b> | 29 |
| <b>2006</b> | 30 |

Number of Full Bilingual Endorsements

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| <b>2004</b> | 96 |
| <b>2005</b> | 85 |
| <b>2006</b> | 89 |

Mr. Jim DiCello asked if out-of-state teachers are still allowed to teach if they do not earn their SEI endorsement in the first year. Ms. Amator said that out-of-state teachers are given one year to complete their provisional SEI endorsement and must do so before receiving any additional

certification services. Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan asked if a teacher has the provisional SEI endorsement and does not complete the full SEI endorsement requirements by the time of teaching certificate renewal, will the teaching certificate renewal be denied. Ms. Amator answered, "Yes." She stated that if teachers (and administrators) have only the provisional SEI endorsement and this endorsement has expired, they will not be re-certified. This directive is printed on the teaching certificate so that teachers will know that they must get the full SEI endorsement.

Ms. Irene Moreno, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Office of English Acquisitions, Arizona Department of Education, presented the history of the development of the SEI endorsement. See Attachment D, *SEI Background Information*. Ms. Moreno stated that the 2000 *Flores vs. Arizona* court case drove revisions to Arizona Revised Statutes regarding English language learners (ELL). A significant outcome of *Flores vs. Arizona* was that the State had failed to provide ELL children with a program of instruction enabling them to master the standard academic curriculum and to become proficient in English language skills. Also in 2000, Arizona voters approved Proposition 203. Proposition 203 mandated that all instruction be in English and that children be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible. Both *Flores vs. Arizona* and Proposition 203 dramatically affected the education of ELLs. One change was in *A.R.S. 15-756. Programs for English learners; requirements; federal funding* (2002-2003), which created a "structured English immersion" endorsement.

On September 11, 2003, English Acquisition Services convened a task force to outline SEI endorsement requirements and to make recommendations to ADE. This first task force did not reach a consensus, although the majority of the members recommended that an SEI endorsement should be required of all new and existing certified teachers. A second SEI Endorsement Task Force convened on September 30, 2003. This Task Force reached consensus and recommended that the SEI endorsement be required of all new and existing certified teachers, all principals, and ELL coordinators, and exempted current certified teachers who have either a Bilingual or ESL endorsement from the SEI endorsement requirement. The recommendations from the second SEI Task Force were developed by statewide representatives from the ELL field and represented interests of state universities, community colleges, high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools.

A third SEI Endorsement Task Force convened on December 9, 2003. This Task Force consisted of both ELL and non-ELL practitioners. The members reviewed the statutory requirements for the SEI endorsement, the recommendations from the previous Task Force, and developed additional recommendations. The December SEI Task Force supported prior recommendations, clarified language in the recommendations, and expanded the SEI requirements to include all administrators. As a result of the adoption of the Rules R7-2-613 on June 28, 2004, a new SEI Task Force met twice to develop the SEI Endorsement Training Criteria and the SEI instructor qualifications.

Ms. Jan Amator, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Certification, Arizona Department of Education, reviewed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Highly Qualified criteria with Task

Force members. See Attachment E. Ms. Amator stated that through the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act, the federal government set parameters for public education. The No Child Left Behind Act requires that, in order for states to receive federal money for education, they must have a State Plan, approved by USDOE, to have all core academic subjects must be taught by Highly Qualified teachers. In Arizona's approved State Plan, we were granted an extension for use of the HOUSSE. To be considered Highly Qualified, a teacher must hold a bachelor's degree, a valid Arizona teaching certificate, demonstrate content competence by passing the Arizona Educator Proficiency Assessments (AEPA) subject knowledge test, hold an advanced degree in the core academic subject area, hold National Board Certification in the core academic subject area, or earn a minimum of 100 points of the AZ HOUSSE (rubric for the specific academic subject. This rubric takes into account teaching experience, coursework, and professional development in the core academic subject. It is anticipated that when NCLB is reauthorized, the focus will be on "highly effective" teachers and principals, and the AZ HOUSSE may be discontinued as an alternate measurement.

Mr. Alan Maguire asked if the AZ HOUSSE (High, Objective, Uniform State Standard of Evaluation) was developed from federal law, and if federal law dictated how it would be defined. Ms. Amator stated that the federal law told states to develop their own definitions. Ms. Karen Merritt asked if a teacher is considered Highly Qualified in another state and moves to Arizona, if that teacher would be considered Highly Qualified here. Ms. Amator stated that prior to November 4, 2004, the teacher would not have been considered Highly Qualified in Arizona. However, at its November 4, 2006 meeting, the State Board of Education approved reciprocity for highly qualified states. Therefore, if a teacher is considered Highly Qualified in another state, the teacher can be considered Highly Qualified in Arizona as long as the teacher has the documentation. Ms. Johanna Haver asked that once the AZ HOUSSE is sunsetted, will a teacher lose his or her Highly Qualified status. Ms. Amator stated that once a measurement defines a teacher as Highly Qualified in a specific subject area, the teacher may continue to use the HOUSSE to verify Highly Qualified status for that specific subject. However, if the teacher wanted to switch content areas, the HOUSSE would not be an option to meet the Highly Qualified content specialization of the new requirements. Mr. Jim DiCello asked if a charter school was not funded by Title 1, did it need to comply with the Highly Qualified regulations. Ms. Amator stated that since the state of Arizona receives federal funds, all public schools within the state must comply with the federal Highly Qualified requirements.

## **5. Review of Compensatory Instruction Program Plan/Budget Request Form**

Ms. Irene Moreno, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Office of English Acquisitions, Arizona Department of Education, presented the Compensatory Instruction Program Plan form for the Task Force to review. See Attachment F. Ms. Moreno stated that the form needed to be easy to understand and "user friendly" for districts to complete, yet contain the necessary information. The presented form is seven pages. The last page contains relevant portions of the Arizona Revised Statutes. All numbers provided by districts of participating English language learners and eligible fluent English proficient students will be verified through SAIS. Page two of the

Compensatory Instruction Program Plan requires LEAs to provide specific program information. A Title III NCLB requirements for a Parental Support component has been added to page six. ADE used feedback from the Practitioners of English Language Learners (PELL) conference in Tucson to streamline the form.

Ms. Sharon Walker, Director of the Division of School Audits, Arizona Office of the Auditor General, also spoke about the Compensatory Education budget request form. She stated that the Auditor General's office has looked at the draft forms and will provide input but clarified that it is not their responsibility to approve the form; that task belongs to the Department of Education. It is the responsibility of the Auditor General's office to conduct the audits of school districts to determine compliance. There are four audits: The accounting and reporting requirements which need to be updated, the bi-annual audit which monitors ELL programs performance outcomes and mobility of ELL students, the financial audit which ADE monitors, and the performance audit of randomly-selected LEAs.

Chairman Alan Maguire asked the Task Force if they believed they had fulfilled the task of reviewing the Compensatory Education budget request form. Mr. Jim DiCello moved to stipulate that the Task Force reviewed the statewide Compensatory Instruction Budget Request Form as required in Section 15-756.11., A.R.S. The motion was seconded by Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan. Mr. Maguire made a roll call and the motion passed with six votes in favor. Three Task Force members were absent.

## **6. Presentation and discussion of information compiled from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) presentations to the Task Force**

Mr. Alan Maguire reviewed with Task Force members a list of requests for additional information from several schools districts and charters schools that had made presentations. ADE has created a document to track request-for-information e-mails and is compiling information as the information is received. Dr. John Baracy asked about the status of a request he made for Sunnyside Unified School District's cost-per-student data. This request will be added to the document. (See Attachment G).

## **7. Call to the Public**

Mr. Alan Maguire made a call to the public at 3:36pm. No public testimony was given.

## **8. Discussion of future meetings**

Mr. Alan Maguire asked all Task Force members to complete the January availability matrix so that January meetings could be scheduled.

**9. Adjournment**

Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan moved and Mr. Jim DiCello seconded that the December 18, 2006 ELL Task Force meeting be adjourned. All members approved the motion. The meeting adjourned at 3:37 pm.

**Arizona ELL Task Force**

Alan Maguire, Chairman  
February 23, 2007